



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

OCTOBER, 1918

THE ISSUES OF THE CAMPAIGN

BY THE EDITOR

WHILE ordinarily a National election in time of war is deplorable upon many grounds, certain phases of the forthcoming campaign for control of the Congress tend in no small measure to mitigate the misfortune. Chief among the advantages obviously is the opportunity afforded to disinfect the legislative establishment. When the present Congress was chosen two years ago the country was still at peace and was so desirous of continuing to avoid actual embroilment that it confirmed the Democratic party in power, not merely in recognition of its success in keeping out of war, but in the hope, if not full expectation, that neutrality might be maintained indefinitely.

Inevitably, during the campaign, public attention was riveted upon the rival nominees for the Presidency, to the virtual exclusion of consideration of the relative merits of candidates for the Senate and the House of Representatives. Consequently when, much sooner than had been anticipated, the crisis came and Mr. Wilson necessarily accepted the gage of battle insolently hurled at him by an arrogant Power, there arose in the minds of his party followers no little perturbation. Greatly to their credit, in view of the disaffection which permeated their respective States and districts, a large majority of the Democratic representatives stood manfully with their leader in his final patriotic determination to vindicate the honor of the Nation, but many heeded the call with obvious reluctance and a few refused absolutely to respond.

Here, lest we forget, let us pause to record the names

of those chosen representatives of the American people who voted in effect to haul down the flag of the Republic:

SENATE

Republicans.—Gronna of North Dakota, La Follette of Wisconsin, Norris of Nebraska.—3.

Democrats.—Stone of Missouri, Lane of Oregon, Vardaman of Mississippi.—3.

Not voting.—Gore of Oklahoma, Democrat, reported ill.—1.

Absent.—Bankhead, Goff, Hollis, Newlands, Smith of Maryland, Thomas, Tillman, each of whom, it was announced, would, if present, have voted for the resolution.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Republicans.—Bacon, Michigan, since unseated; Britten, Illinois; Browne, Wisconsin; Cary, Wisconsin; Cooper, Wisconsin; Davidson, Wisconsin; Davis, Minnesota; Dillon, South Dakota; Esch, Wisconsin; Frear, Wisconsin; Fuller, Illinois; Haugen, Iowa; Hayes, California; Hull, Iowa; Johnson, South Dakota; King, Illinois; Kinkaid, Nebraska; Knutson, Minnesota; La Follette, Washington; Little, Kansas; Lundeen, Minnesota; Mason, Illinois; Nelson, Wisconsin; Reavis, Nebraska; Roberts, Nevada; Rodenburg, Illinois; Sloan, Nebraska; Stafford, Wisconsin; Voight, Wisconsin; Wheeler, Illinois; Woods, Iowa.—31.

Democrats.—Almon, Alabama; Burnett, Alabama; Church, California; Connelly, Kansas; Decker, Missouri; Dill, Washington; Dominick, South Carolina; Hensley, Missouri; Hilliard, Colorado; Igoe, Missouri; Keating, Colorado; Kitchin, North Carolina; McLemore, Texas; Rankin, Montana; Shackleford, Missouri; Sherwood, Ohio; Van Dyke, Minnesota.—17.

Prohibitionist.—Randall, California.—1.

Socialist.—London, New York.—1.

Not voting.—Meeker, Fields, Bleakley, Capstick, Helgesen, Hill, Lee, Georgia; Powers, Webb.—9.

Of the Senators recorded as having voted against the Declaration of War, Stone and Lane have died, Vardaman has been defeated for renomination at the instigation of the President, and Norris has been renominated by the Republicans of Nebraska. Of the Representatives many have been defeated at the party primaries, including Mr. Shackleford, who was supposed to "own" his district in Missouri, and Mr. Woods of Iowa, who was deposed as Chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee by demand of National Chairman Hays. Indeed, it is not too much to say that those, constituting a majority, from the mid-West States, who voted against the declaration have since discovered that they misinterpreted the sentiment of their con-

stituencies. Certainly, no other section of the country now manifests sterner determination in prosecution of the war. It is only fair, moreover, to note the fact that many Democrats voted against their convictions under the stress of party discipline and that the Republicans have supported the war measures proposed by the President with a far closer approach to unanimity than the members of his own party.

That no question of loyalty, as between the two great political organizations, can be raised successfully in consequence of the action of their representatives in Congress seems, therefore, to be certain. The most notorious offenders on both sides, barring Mr. Kitchin and Mr. Dent, Democratic leaders, have been repudiated already, and only two really sinister figures appear on the political horizon—Henry Ford, a pronounced disloyalist, who claims without contradiction to have accepted the Democratic nomination for Senator in Michigan at the urgent insistence of the President, and George W. Norris, a vehement opponent of many war measures, who carried the Republican primaries with the aid of unnaturalized Germans who, paradoxically and shamefully, are still permitted to vote in Nebraska. Both unquestionably should and one at least, in our judgment, unquestionably will be beaten by the patriotic citizens of their respective commonwealths.

The true issue, then, is not one of loyalty or of degree of loyalty as evidenced comparatively in the past. Nor is the question of efficiency in the prosecution of the war directly involved. That task rests exclusively upon the Executive and it cannot be taken from him during the next two years. True, the Congress might hamper him as the Congress of 1812 did hamper Madison, but of this there is no possible danger. The Republicans have not only proved in the past their determination to win through victory, but have pledged it for the future, in such manner as to leave no doubt of their sincerity. In point of fact, the Republican party has been from the beginning and is to-day distinctively the "war party" of the Union. While not doubting for a moment the fixity of the President's present resolution to compel a complete triumph over the barbaric foe, we feel by no means certain that members of his party in Congress might not accept a settlement which their Republican colleagues would reject with scorn.

This, too, we are convinced, is the impression abroad as

well as at home. We may not deny, in truth, that the many and varied conciliatory endeavors of the President in the past, accompanied by unhappy phrases not easily forgotten, begot in the minds of our present allies an apprehension of wavering which dies slowly. Although we are glad to believe that it has now dissolved under the strong light of actual performance, one could not but note with interest the extraordinary acclaim, in England and in France, if not of relief, at least of utmost satisfaction, at the inflexible tone of Senator Lodge's recent notable utterance. The insistence, then, of Democratic orators that the election of a Republican Congress would indicate impairment of our war spirit and so bear grief to our allies and joy to the enemy constitutes neither sound argument nor convincing appeal. As well might the Germans fear to create an impression of weakening by supplanting von Hertling with von Hindenburg or Ludendorff as we by fetching more actively into the fray the party led by Roosevelt and Taft and Lodge. Savagely as they hate and greatly as they are beginning to fear the President, they can have no illusions respecting those who were the first to cry out for force without stint or limit. Nor, of course, have our allies. Indeed, if there be any potency whatever in this vapid reasoning,—a matter of doubt in the light of Mr. Wilson's own inexorable attitude,—it lies rather with the Republicans as demonstrating to our allies a complete fusion of all our resources, moral, mental and material.

Nevertheless, it is the Republicans who must assume the offensive in the forthcoming campaign. The Democrats have made their record and must stand upon it. As the President himself declared bravely and tersely in his address to Congress on May 27:

The elections are at hand, and we ought as soon as possible to go and render an intimate account of our trusteeship to the people who delegated us to act for them in the weighty and anxious matters that crowd upon us in these days of critical choice and action. . . .

These are days when duty stands stark and naked, and even with closed eyes we know it is there. Excuses are unavailing. We have either done our duty or we have not. The fact will be as gross and plain as the duty itself.

That is the situation, and it is the situation which creates the duty, no choice or preference of ours. There is only one way to meet that duty. We must meet it without selfishness or fear of consequences.

Politics is adjourned. The elections will go to those who think least of it: to those who go to the constituencies without explanations or

excuses, with a plain record of duty faithfully and disinterestedly performed.

I, for one, am always confident that the people of this country will give a just verdict upon the service of the men who act for them when the facts are such that no man can disguise or conceal them.

Acting faithfully upon the principle thus set forth, the President has confined his activities in uprooting disloyalty strictly to his own political household and flatly refused to intercede in behalf of Democratic candidates in Maine,—a fact which, we are pleased to record, Representative Hersey, one of the Republican members returned, publicly acclaimed in the House of Representatives as greatly to his credit. Previously, it is true, Mr. Wilson had intervened in Wisconsin in an unbecoming manner, which we doubt not he now regrets, and had bestowed upon the Ford candidacy a blessing which we still hope he may withdraw, but in a large sense he has shown his appreciation of Republican support by refraining from interference in Republican affairs. To this extent, at any rate, he has proved the sincerity of his early declaration to the effect that this is a people's, not a partisan nor a personal, war.

Whether in his appointments of individuals to positions of great power he has risen to the same high plane is a matter of opinion; we think not; that is to say, we consider the fact to be unmistakably plain that, despite his naming of Mr. Root, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Schwab, Mr. Vanderlip and others, in far too many instances he has designated Democrats simply because they were Democrats when he might have selected Republicans of markedly superior capabilities. Even more rightfully censurable has been his retention in high office, from a mistaken sense of personal loyalty, of men notoriously unfit to perform their allotted functions in so grave a crisis. Of the soundness of this judgment, the mere fact of no change, in time of war, in a Cabinet confessedly second-rate in time of peace, constitutes sufficient evidence.

Refusal to appoint a War Council comprising the best minds of the Nation, the studious application of which would surely have averted the more calamitous delinquencies which have marred the record of the Administration, must be accounted greatly to his debit.

It is in these failures, amounting in some instances to actual crimes, in production, particularly of aircraft, ships, large guns and shells, to say nothing of the unconscionable

delays, waste and extravagance, arising from conflict of authorities and lack of organization, that the opposition finds ample cause for legitimate reproach.

Hardly less deserving of condemnation, if we look to the future, is the obvious intention of members of the Cabinet as well as of the Congress to take advantage of the necessities of war to fasten irretrievably upon the people government ownership, sumptuary restrictions and the like, without adequate consideration of their respective merits or specific approval of the country.

Perhaps most reprehensible of all and surely most applicable from a legislative standpoint, when the whole people are accepting uncomplainingly unprecedented burdens for time present and time to come, is taxation imposed with gross unfairness by the representatives of one section upon the citizens of another. It may serve the purpose of the bucolic leader of the House of Representatives to disavow such a design, but when, as at present, his acts discord so sharply with his words that the more enlightened Secretary of the Treasury is moved to protest, though thus far in vain, the pretense becomes too plain for doubt. The distinction between the views of the two leaders, moreover, is peculiarly apt at this time, when a Congress, not an Executive, is to be chosen.

The issues, then, are clear: Upon the part of the Democratic party, its record in the waging of war and its indicated course in reconstruction; upon the part of the Republican party, succinctly stated:

First—Win the war, and win it absolutely and thoroughly.

Second—Prepare now for the problems of peace—problems political, social and economic.

Third—Defend the Government of the United States from those who would overturn it for some form of socialistic republic or democracy, in whatever form it presents itself.

The line of demarcation which has persisted since the Civil War remains unchanged and apparently unchangeable. We frankly can perceive no reason why adherents of the recognized principles and policies of their respective parties should not vote for the candidates who personify them, so that they be true Americans of undoubted loyalty to their country. That citizens unbound by allegiance to either organization will weigh and measure more scrupulously than

usual the evidences respecting the past and present and the varying promises as to the future, and heed the dictates of their conscientious determination, we cannot doubt,—and, fortunately for our beloved country, it is their calm, thoughtful and patriotic judgment, uninfluenced by emotion or partisan considerations, that will turn the scale.

A PROUD AND LOYAL STATE

THE August number of *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW* contained, in its department entitled “Letters to the Editor,” a communication bearing the signature “Henry Wray,”—a name assumed by Mr. H. R. Walmsley of No. 3410 Smart Avenue, Kansas City,—making serious reflections upon the loyalty of the citizens of New Mexico and upon the fidelity of both the Legislature and courts of that commonwealth, marking it as essentially disloyal in sympathy and controlled in its public policy by a secret organization called the Penitentes.

A few days after such publication we received the following telegram from Senator Albert B. Fall:

THREE RIVERS, N. M., August 7.

SIR,—The August issue of your *REVIEW*, pages 312-14 inclusive, has a letter signed by one Henry Wray, Kansas City, which in so far as concerns the State of New Mexico, is a heterogeneous, fantastic mixture of ignorant, malicious and false statements and slanders. I have read the *REVIEW* for thirty-five years and am now a subscriber. Also, knowing you, I cannot believe that you ever read this letter or would have permitted the publication of so vile a slander upon my State and its people.

You owe an apology to your readers and to the people of this State. New Mexico's population of Spanish descent are as loyal, patriotic Americans as yourself or your forefathers. The New Mexicans swore allegiance to the United States, represented by General Kearny, in 1846, their Governor and his army, not being supported by the people, leaving the State without firing a shot. Only fifteen years afterward they furnished more men in proportion to the population for the defense of the Union than did the people of any other State or Territory. They furnished more than their quota to fight people of their blood in 1898. Ask Colonel Roosevelt about George Armijo, Abel Duran, Captain Max Luna, and others.

Kit Carson is dead, but the records of the War Department will show the names of soldiers of his regiment, as well as those of Colonel J. Frank Chaves; and the battlefields of Valverde, Glorieta and others

are records of our loyalty. After the massacre of Santa Isabel and the raid on Columbus, native citizens offered President Wilson ten thousand New Mexicans of Spanish-American blood for the protection of American citizens in Mexico. Between twelve and sixteen thousand New Mexicans are in the Army, Marine Corps and Navy now offering their lives for their country and the protection, among others, of Colonel Harvey and Mr. Wray. The statements as to districts without English-speaking persons are false. As to public school teachers not speaking English, that is worse than false. As to the Legislature and courts being conducted in Spanish, that is untrue. Examine the journals and acts of Legislatures, State and Territorial, and court records in the offices of the Attorney General and Supreme Court, and in the archives of the Congressional Library. There are ten weekly papers, out of more than one hundred, published in Spanish.

The story as to the Penitentes is a wild dream; there is no truth in the statements as to a law attempting to protect (them) New Mexico. The statutes are founded on those of Missouri. The original code was written by Willard Hall of Missouri. Until 1897 the common law, even in pleadings, followed in all purity the code adopted from New York, Missouri, and California. Your weekly publication should anticipate the monthly REVIEW in correction, and apologize.

(Signed) ALBERT B. FALL.

Complying with the request of Senator Fall, we published immediately in the *WAR WEEKLY* his telegram, and added the following footnote:

[We agree with Senator Fall that the letter ought not to have been published, and we hasten to tender unqualified apology to New Mexico and to everybody in it.—EDITOR.]

Since that publication on August 17, we have received letters of denial and protestation from the following citizens and associations of New Mexico:

Hon. Albert B. Fall, United States Senator.
 Hon. Andrieus A. Jones, United States Senator.
 Hon. W. B. Walton, Representative from New Mexico.
 Hon. Antonio Lucero, Secretary of State.
 Hon. W. H. H. Llewellyn, Speaker of the House.
 Hon. S. Burrhait, United States Attorney.
 Hon. Frank H. Winston, Member of the House.

E. C. Crampton, chairman of Colfax County Council of National Defense; J. G. Moir, M.D., Deming; Mrs. Marion Ruleau, Magdalena; Jefferson Reynolds, president of the First National Bank, Las Vegas; F. T. Cheetham, Taos; Charles W. G. Ward, East Las Vegas; Beverly Bauer, Santa Fe; Frank W. Clancy, Santa Fe; S. I. Roberts, Carlsbad; T. W. Gibson, Albuquerque; F. H. Wittram, Albuquerque *Morning Journal*; Charles S. Rawles, Santa Fe; Lawrence F. Lee, Albuquerque:

Edna Johnson, Santa Fe; Charles Springer, chairman Executive Committee of the New Mexico Council of Defense; D. B. Bacu, Quemado; Edwin F. Coard, Santa Fe; E. M. Smith, Springfield, Mo.; R. B. Schonmater, Las Vegas; E. A. Roberts, Carlsbad; C. L. Parsons, secretary Republican Central Committee; William McKean, Taos; F. W. Campbell, cashier Bowman Bank and Trust Company, Las Cruces; A. B. M. Miller, president Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce; Elmer E. Studley, New York; Felix Bacca, Albuquerque.

Resolutions by: Republican State Central Committee; Executive Committee of American Red Cross; Santa Fe Lodge No. 460, B. P. O. Elks; Albuquerque Rotary Club, by Louis A. McRae, John Tombs and Aldo Feofold, committee; Magdalena Chamber of Commerce; mass meeting of citizens of Las Cruces, by William Alexander Sutherland, chairman.

The testimony contained in these communications, corroborated by responses to such further inquiries as we have been able to make, is convincing and overwhelming. No fair mind could fail to be assured by the evidence submitted of the unqualified allegiance of the State of New Mexico to the Union, of the integrity of its government and its courts and, perhaps most impressively of all, of the splendid loyalty of its citizens to itself. It is clearly incumbent upon us, therefore, to go much farther than we did go promptly in agreeing with Senator Fall that the letter "ought not to have been published" and in tendering "unqualified apology to New Mexico and to everybody in it."

It would be idle to attempt to make excuse for the admission of the letter to these pages, even as a communication, for the simple reason that no conceivable excuse could be regarded as in any degree adequate. That its publication was the consequence of sheer inadvertence and of nothing else should and, it affords us no little gratification to remark, to the minds of a large majority of our correspondents, does go without saying. Nevertheless, not only as in duty bound but from a sincere desire to make whatever reparation lies within our power to render, we express our deep regret that these pages should have been marred by such calumny and to add, with so much of satisfaction as can be derived from so deplorable a happening, that, as an American, we, too, are proud of New Mexico,—prouder than of any other State in the Union, except, of course, Vermont.

Nothing could please us better than to print in full all of the communications, indignant, reproachful and otherwise, which we have received, but a glance at the long list of signatures will indicate the reasons why pursuance of that course

is impracticable. Perhaps it will suffice to present the remarks in Congress of Representative Walton, which comprise the substance of the observations of our many correspondents, to wit:

Were it not that some of the people of the United States have seemed to be in absolute ignorance of conditions in the West, and especially the Southwest, I would not expend the breath necessary to make an answer to this classic in libel and epic in vicious slander. Were it not that *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW* is a magazine of standing in contemporary periodical journalism and its editor a man who for many years has played a conspicuous rôle in the political history of his time, I would be content to let the infamous libel expend itself on the empty air of an unheeding circulation. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that facts may develop to show that the editor of the magazine has been imposed upon in the publication of this article, for I believe him to be a man big enough, of sufficient broad mind, to realize the wrong that he has done, and that he will endeavor to make suitable and proper reparation. But the times and the circumstances demand that the lies should not go unchallenged, and I shall ask the indulgence of this House while I briefly refute a wretched slander upon a large portion of my constituency and tell the truth about a brave, a loyal, a patriotic, and a progressive people.

The gist of the argument of "America's unguarded gateway" is that the Spanish-American population of New Mexico is not loyal to the United States; that a Mexican army, raised by German influence and paid by German gold, would have no difficulty in invading this country through New Mexico; but, on the other hand, it would be encouraged, recruited, and rationed by the Spanish-Americans of that State.

This lie is so grotesque, Mr. Chairman, that it would be cause for laughter did it not attack the honor and patriotism of a proud and sensitive people. The record of New Mexico during the Civil War speaks for itself. The showing of the State in the war with Spain proves conclusively that not only is the native population of New Mexico loyal to America, but it is loyal even against Spain itself.

When trouble with Mexico became acute in 1916 and the National Guard was called out to guard the Mexican border it was the New Mexico National Guard, Mr. Chairman, composed of about one-half Spanish-American boys, that was first to respond and that was first on duty on the border. They were stationed at Columbus, one of the danger points of the entire boundary line. They spent eleven months of the hardest sort of camp drudgery and were the last of all the National Guard units to be relieved from service. And these Spanish-American boys, called upon to protect their State from Mexican invasion, made as fine a showing as any guardsmen on the border. These are the people, Mr. Chairman, that are denounced in *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW* as disloyal—as being willing to support and ration a Mexican army under German influence for the invasion of the United States.

Thousands of Spanish-American youths are now proudly wearing

the khaki of the American Army, some of them having already made the supreme sacrifice for the cause of liberty. Millions of dollars invested by Spanish-American citizens of New Mexico in Liberty Bonds and War Savings Stamps attest their devotion to the country which has protected them and for which they are willing to give their lives.

Buttressing this lie, which is the mainspring of his argument, the Kansas City correspondent tells so many smaller lies that it is impossible for me to reply to them in detail in the time allotted me. The one that "New Mexico has remained Mexican in every sense of the word" is plainly intended to convey an inference that the Spanish-American population of New Mexico is one in sympathy and interest with the peon of Mexico.

The Spanish-Americans of New Mexico are descendants of the Conquistadores, who wrested the Southwest from the savage tribes of Indians. The blood of nobility flows in their veins. They are courageous, truthful, upright, and honorable. For seventy-five years they and their ancestors have been living under progressive American institutions. They are law-abiding, peaceful, and industrious.

In this article, Mr. Chairman, the charge is made that Spanish is largely spoken in New Mexico. This is true to an extent, just as it is true that French is spoken in Louisiana, Scandinavian in the Northwest, Finnish in Michigan, and "57 different varieties" in New York, Chicago, Boston, and other large centers. The State constitution provides that the public schools shall always be conducted in English, and the only exceptions are where Spanish is taught as a separate subject or where Spanish may be used in explaining the meaning of English words to Spanish-speaking pupils who do not understand English. And, Mr. Chairman, there is no more beautiful language in the world than Spanish, and especially at the present time is a knowledge of the Spanish language becoming more and more important in our commercial and our business life. To possess a knowledge of Spanish is a qualification of which anyone may be proud.

And, speaking of New Mexico schools, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of this committee, I wish that each of you could go, as I have gone, through some of the rural schools of New Mexico and see these little Spanish-American children who, with their parents, are the subject of this libel. All over the State new schoolhouses—clean, well-ventilated, well-lighted—dot the landscape. Over each schoolhouse is an American flag. In every schoolroom the little ones are taught what that flag means; that it means freedom within the law, equal opportunity, justice, and right. They are taught to sing the patriotic American songs. They are taught what it means to be an American. And I say to you here that they are growing up to be far better Americans in every essential sense of the word than the man who uses his half-baked knowledge of the English language and of American history to traduce them and their people.

In that part of the attack on New Mexico which refers to the so-called "Penitentes" the correspondent of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW has merely in his article repeated a lot of old women's tales which have in times past been told of this organization and which have been stoutly denied and repudiated. The statement that "the deserts

are dotted with their Calvary crosses, at which human crucifixions are annually carried out," and that "the Federal and State courts obey the mandates of the Penitentes and no Penitente is ever convicted in court, no matter what the evidence," are simply bald lies, which no one with ordinary reasoning powers and ordinary opportunities for observation could conceivably be brought to believe.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that I have touched upon all of the principal points in this publication affecting the Spanish-American people of New Mexico which can be considered of the least importance, but in order that nothing may be overlooked, I desire to emphatically brand as unqualifiedly false the statements that the use of the Spanish language, when necessary for the proceedings of court, the legislature, or other assemblies constitute any just reflection upon the loyalty of the people; that there is any secret or other organization that improperly influences the court, the legislature, election machinery, local administration, or any element of public or private life; that the United States Government or any of its departments has wrongfully deprived any of our citizens of their rights or improperly extended any of their privileges.

While this statement by Representative Walton seems to cover the main points, we cannot refrain from acknowledging as handsomely as may be the consideration and courtesy extended to us by our New Mexico friends, even in the heat of their righteous indignation. Speaker Llewellyn, for example, informs us that, but for "the high character of your magazine," the matter would have been contemptuously ignored,—which is as pleasing as it is polite; then the officers of the Rotary Club proffer their cordial co-operation in any investigation we may care to make, if in doubt with respect to the facts; a prominent attorney of El Paso takes the trouble to write that our brief paragraph in the *WAR WEEKLY* was read at the meeting of the Republican State Committee and "seemed to be regarded as satisfactory"; Mr. Bacu pays tribute to our "hitherto creditable publication," which seems fair enough under the circumstances, and recognizes its general popularity, which we must say it surely does or did enjoy if the number of its readers in New Mexico be accepted as a criterion; Editor Wittram is surprised that we are "not better informed," meaning, we suppose, "more attentive," an opinion in which we readily concur; Mrs. Ruleau, too, like ourselves, is "overcome with amazement that a publication such as yours should be so negligent"; our old friend Mr. Clancy is "grieved beyond all expression and equally perplexed," since "so much indignation could not have been aroused in New Mexico by anyone but you

and *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW*," and we cannot blame him; Mr. Lucero says "it is a mystery to us all" that we, of all persons, should have gone wrong, and so on.

Yet more gratifying are the proffered hospitalities of our gracious fellow citizens. Mr. Rawles is quite convinced that it would do us good "to travel a bit and come down here for a few weeks"; Commissioner Cheetham invites us to attend the famous Indian fiesta at Taos; President Miller of the Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce extends "a most cordial invitation to visit New Mexico, and especially Albuquerque" and promises the finest kind of welcome; and the Grand Jury of Socorro County was so eager for a visit that it resorted to the old-time method of securing our presence by indicting us for criminal libel upon a sovereign State,—a vastly complimentary and wholly novel proceeding, to the best of our recollection, in the history of American jurisprudence.

So there are compensations after all. We would go, too, in a minute if we could get away; but we feel that we ought to stay around just now and see if we cannot speed up things while Mr. Baker is abroad and we have a chance. What we feel it necessary to do more than anything else just now is to compel our Government to back up to the limit those thirteen thousand boys from New Mexico and the other thousands from other States who are fighting and dying for their country in Picardy and Flanders, to the end that no American lives shall be sacrificed needlessly.

So, regretfully, we must decline these flattering invitations for the present, but later—well, do not ask us if you should not want us; but, breathe it softly, we *might* fetch the Colonel.

BEWARE THE PEACE DRIVE!

THE Peace Drive is the peril. Foch, Haig and Pershing will attend to the war drives. It is for us to deal with the other. For it will be made. It has just been made at Berlin and Vienna, by Kaiser and Kaiserling in person, and various Ministers. That drive, the strongest yet made by the Huns, was met and utterly routed in an hour by our President, speaking promptly and bravely and truly for America and for all the Allied Powers. But it will be repeated and re-

newed, in Protean forms. It is being made. Its insidious and plausible venom subtly permeates the land. Here and there people are saying, in view of the magnificent victories of the Allied troops: "Well, we've got them beaten, all right, and now we can afford to let up. There's no use in wasting more lives and money and all that in pounding the Germans when we've got them down. We might as well settle up the affair by negotiation, and end the war this side of the Rhine." So they say, some merely glib and thoughtless, some with deep Hunnish intent. They rely upon the weariness of the war from which they think we are suffering, upon the dislike of the privations and inconveniences of war which they think we feel, and upon the chivalrous impulses which proverbially forbid us to "hit a man when he is down." In all of which reliance, we intend that they shall find themselves disappointed.

Such peace propaganda involves two fatal fallacies.

One is, that the Huns are whipped. They are not whipped. They are going to be whipped, and they are now being whipped, but the process is not yet complete. It is still so far from complete that any cessation of it at this time might mean its reversal and its utter ruin. We speak advisedly. German man power has passed its peak, but it is by no means exhausted. German resources, of munitions, of food, of all the essentials of war, are waning, no doubt, but they are still enormous. German morale is somewhat impaired in some respects, but it is very far from being destroyed, or broken; and to what extent it may be restored in an extremity, in the transformation from an offensive to a defensive war, is a serious question. We must remember that Germany or Prussia on the defensive is an unknown quantity. Since the Napoleonic wars, at least, the Hun has always taken the triumphant aggressive. So he did against Denmark, against Austria, against France in 1870. What he is when he is winning, all the world knows. What he is when he is driven back, when he has his back to the wall in defence of his Fatherland, we have yet to learn. He may not be formidable. He may develop the yellow streak and show himself a coward. We rather think so, but we do not know.

And it will not do to take risks. Let that be borne incessantly in mind. It will not do to take risks. We have already suffered too much, to run the risk of having it made

all in vain. There is too much at stake—as much now as there was at the beginning of the war, and more—for us to jeopard it in even the slightest avoidable degree. It would be a crime against those who have died that we may live, a crime against those who look to us to keep the world fit for them to live in, for us to let slip the smallest advantage which we have gained, or for us to give the enemy the slightest advantage which it is in our power to withhold from him. It would, in brief, be a crime now to listen to any peace overtures, or to stay our hand against the foe for any pacifist pleadings. When the Hun is whipped, we shall consider what sort of peace we shall dictate. But he is not yet whipped.

The other fallacy is, that it is possible to whip the Germans outside of Germany. It cannot be done. Peace cannot be made by victory, not even by the most overwhelming victory, this side of the Rhine. If every man in Ludendorff's army were captured or slain, the Kaiser himself among them, Germany would not be beaten, in her own esteem. From the very beginning the supreme key note of German exultation has been that all the war is waged on foreign soil. The lying pretence is made that it is and was in its inception a defensive war, and that so long as it protects Germany from invasion, it is a successful war. The German Government, Kaiser, Crown Prince, Chancellor, and all the rest, are now sedulously propagating that false conception through their "reptile press" and otherwise, to persuade the German people and the German army that it is true. These latter do in fact believe it to be true. Therefore no matter what happens, they say, "Our armies are victorious, for they are keeping the enemy out of Germany." Therefore if peace were made anywhere this side of the Rhine, it would be regarded as a German peace, as a victory for German arms.

Manifestly, it would be disastrous to the world to have such an impression prevail. It would confirm the German people in that Pan-German arrogance, that notion that they are superior to all the rest of the world, that has been one of the chief roots of the war. On this point, witness the testimony of one of the most eminent German scholars of the time, Professor Hans Delbrueck, of the University of Berlin. Writing in the *Prussian Year Book* he frankly declares that that spirit was one of the prime causes of the war, and that complete renunciation of it is an essential condition

of peace. "The world," he says, "demands, and has a right to demand, that the German people give a guarantee that the Pan-German spirit, the spirit of superiority, of might, of heathenism, is not the German spirit."

That is exactly true. The world has a right to demand that, and the world intends to demand it, and to keep on fighting relentlessly until it secures it. For the war has now got far beyond mere material objects. We are not fighting German armies and submarines and airplanes alone. We are fighting the German spirit which called these things into being and which wantonly launched them against an unprepared and unoffending world for the sheer lust of conquest, of plunder and of rape. We shall not, we can not, be content with defeating merely those material things, if the spirit which is behind them remains undefeated. That is why Professor Delbrueck is so everlastingly right in saying that we have a right to demand a satisfactory renunciation of that spirit by the German people—mark, the German people, and not merely their All Highest overlords.

We have not yet seen any such renunciation, nor any sign of it. Occasionally a voice of sanity and truth is raised, like that of Professor Delbrueck; like that—at times—of Maximilian Harden, for which he gets taken to task and punished; like that of Dr. Muelhon, prudently raised on the Swiss side of the frontier. But we hear no popular response. The voice of the German people is still "Hoch, der Kaiser!" and "Gott strafe Amerika!" And it can be changed in one of only two ways. The German people themselves can change it if they will; as the French people rid themselves of pinchbeck imperialism in 1870. Let them do that, and we shall believe that they have renounced the Pan-German spirit of arrogance and conquest.

The other way in which the end can be attained is that which we are now inexorably pursuing, and which it seems probable we shall have to continue to pursue. That is to strike, and strike, and strike, until the German people are crushed and broken into submission, until by bitter experience they find that they are not superior, that they are not invincible, that their might is not greater than that of the rest of the world. That is what the President had in mind when he said in golden words that "this intolerable Thing, without conscience or honor or capacity for covenanted peace, must be crushed;" and that we cannot discuss peace until the

Thing is crushed and until "the German people have spokesmen whose word we can believe." It is not that we wish to crush the German people. But we mean to crush that Thing, and if the German people cling to it and try to protect it and to uphold it, they too must be crushed until they see the error of their way.

With the chivalrous principle of generosity to a beaten enemy we are in perfect accord. But the time for that comes when the enemy is beaten, and that time in this war is not yet. There are, moreover, enemies upon whom generosity would be wasted, to show it to whom would be a crime. Shall we show lenience to the unrepentant murderers of Edith Cavell, to the butchers of the women and children of the *Lusitania*, to the destroyers of Louvain, to the government that ordered and carried out the deportation of the young women of Belgium and France into the "white slavery" of enforced prostitution? Before God, palsied be the tongue that would suggest it! "Their methods of warfare," truly says the President, "outrage every principle of humanity and knightly honor." Toward such a foe we can show no forbearance. "Crush the infamous thing!" cried Voltaire to d'Alembert. "Crush the intolerable Thing!" responds our President, and all the people say, Amen!

THE WAR AND THE SCHOOLS

THE President's scheme of a national war university system may have arisen from one of several motives, or have one of several aims. To adapt thereto his own thought, uttered concerning another matter of vast importance, the hidden recesses of its origin "we are not interested to search for or explore." It will be sufficient to consider its immediate and its potential effects. Briefly stated, it provides that for the space of the next year all young men of the ages of eighteen and nineteen who can pass the necessary entrance examinations may pursue courses at any of some four hundred colleges at the expense of the Federal Government, until he is needed in active service and is called to the colors.

That is a great thing. Primarily, of course, it is intended to give the young men military instruction, so as to fit them to be officers in the army. In that view it is a definite step toward the fulfilment of the President's proposal of some

years ago, that we shall "provide a system by which every citizen who will volunteer for the training may be made familiar with the use of modern arms, the rudiments of drill and manœuvre, and the maintenance and sanitation of camps." Thus we are to secure that "citizenry trained and accustomed to arms" which the President has described as the protective force of the nation. But of course that will not be all nor nearly all of it. These college courses will also materially increase the competence of the young men for the works of peace. The knowledge of mathematics and sciences which will be acquired will serve them in industries and commerce. The principles of camp sanitation will be applicable to the sanitation of homes and communities. The physical training and the mental and moral discipline which they receive will be to their advantage and to the advantage of their fellows, in peace as well as in war.

This system the President is establishing for one year. That is for the shortest time that the war is reasonably expected to continue. But that inevitably implies its extension for another and yet other years, if the war continues so long; while there is also in it an unmistakable intimation that it may be made permanent after the return of peace. Indeed, it must be recalled that the words of the President which we have quoted, about the establishment of universal military education at national expense, were uttered in December, 1914, more than four years ago, at a time when he confidently expected that we should keep out of the great war and when, therefore, he obviously meant them to be applied to conditions of peace. We are thus surely warranted in assuming the present plan to be a step toward the fulfilment of that design.

But this in turn implies a vast extension of the system thus established. These thousands of young men in these colleges will be trained to become officers. But not of officers alone can an army be composed. For the thousands of potential officers there must be millions of potential privates, and these, too, must have a considerable measure of instruction and training. They cannot all go to college; wherefore there is prescribed a radical addition to the curriculums of schools below collegiate rank. Those of the high schools must be amplified, so as to prepare the students to enter the military classes of the colleges, or so as to give the necessary instruction to those who cannot go on to college. It

would be folly to provide college courses and not to provide preparation for entering them. Again, this implies a necessity of a certain degree of elementary military preparation in the grammar schools, which are the feeders to the high schools. You might make changes in the lower grades of schooling without extending them into the upper grades; but if you make such changes at the top, you must make them all the way down to the foot. The President's plan logically involves, therefore, a recasting of the entire educational system of the country.

This is logical, since there is nothing more obvious than that as a result of the war our entire domestic system, industrial and political, will be largely transformed. Nothing will ever again be as it was before. We hope that it will be better. We are going to strive to the utmost of our ability to make it better. But if that is done, if everything is made better than it was before the war, our educational system must be adapted to the new conditions and to the new requirements.

This obvious fact was promptly recognized in England, and was acted upon by that conservative and slow-going country with a readiness and vigor which we energetic and up-to-date Americans might well emulate. A sweeping national Education Act has just been adopted in that country which is at once a great war measure and a great peace measure. Under its provisions, going into effect immediately upon the conclusion of peace, there will be universal compulsory public education in England at least as complete as in the United States. Every English child will be required to attend school until he or she is fourteen years old; no English child will be permitted to work for hire when under twelve years of age; and none will be permitted to give a full day's work for hire until he or she is eighteen. That will make education universal, and will abolish the evils of child labor. The act containing these provisions has been all but ignored outside of England, amid the great flood of war news, but we mistake greatly if it will not be hereafter recognized as one of the most important permanent enactments of these epochal times.

We may have in this country no need of precisely such a law as that. But we have need of an extensive reconstruction or reorganization of our educational system. The war should have a dual effect upon it. One is, to set us to edu-

cating and training all men for the essential duties of war as well as of peace. It will not do to say that we will not give military training because the chances are that it will never be needed. Every educator knows that every considerable curriculum contains much that the pupils will probably never practically use; and insists that it shall contain it. Such studies are put into the curriculum partly for the sake of the liberal information and culture which they provide, and the enjoyment which they will afford; and partly for the sake of mental discipline and the ability which will thus be gained for the doing of necessary things. Just so the lad in the gymnasium or in home calisthenics swings Indian clubs or dumb-bells, not because he will ever need to do so in business or industry, but because he will thus develop his muscles and improve his health, and make himself better able to swing a hammer or to work in the counting-room. So military science should be taught to all, for three reasons. One is, the possibility which always exists, however remote, that the practice of it may some time be needed. Another is, that the more fully and generally it is taught, the less likelihood there will be of its ever being needed in practice. And the third is, the immense practical value of it in the pursuits of peace, through mental culture, through moral discipline, and through physical hygiene.

The other effect which the war should have upon our educational system is to cause us to adapt it to the uses and the needs of peace as well as of war, to the enormously increased degree which this war has revealed to us. It should thus impel us to teach the truths instead of the falsehoods of history. It is notorious that our textbooks have contained many most mischievous perversions, concerning our relations with other nations, and concerning various great events in our history. It would be difficult, for example, to find a school history of the United States which gave a correct, or which did not give a mischievously incorrect, account of the origin, the conduct and the results of the War of 1812; and to that misteaching some grave errors of the present day are directly to be traced. We ought by this time to be big enough and brave enough and honest enough to tell the truth about ourselves, even though at times it may hurt what we conceive to be our pride.

We need to teach a truer conception of America and of American citizenship. There has been far too much regard-

ing America as a sort of modern "chosen people," set apart from the rest of the world, unique in its relationships or lack of relationships with other nations, and quite exempt from the otherwise universal laws which obtain in the worldwide community of States. It is time for us to keep such folly out of our children's heads, and to face the fact that we are "as common mortals." That was the conception of the founders of the nation, who in the Declaration of Independence took pains to say that the new commonwealth which they were forming was to have all the functions, all the rights and powers, and all the responsibilities of other free and independent states. Had that view prevailed among us more completely, and had we been governed by it, we should not at the beginning of the present war have been in the embarrassing position in which we found ourselves.

We need in our schools hereafter, but beginning to-day, to teach thrift as we have never taught it before. Hitherto, indeed, we have too greatly taught the reverse of thrift. School books have dwelt upon the inexhaustible magnitude and wealth of our resources, and have thus fostered an exaggerated conception of them, the natural result of which has been extravagance and waste. The war has made retrenchment and strict economy compulsory; and these things have borne upon us the more hardly and the more unpleasantly because of our former lack of thrift, which has on the one hand accustomed us to extravagance, and on the other has squandered our resources and so depleted our supplies.

Above all, perhaps, we should begin to-day to teach the facts concerning this war, its remote and immediate causes, the methods by which it has been waged, and the aims with which it is being prosecuted, both by the Germans and by the Allies. Every schoolboy in America should have it indelibly impressed upon his mind and heart that the war was purposely brought on by Germany, in pursuance of a plan of world-conquest which she had been cherishing and elaborating for fifty years; that it was begun on false pretexts at a time craftily chosen by Germany when she was fully prepared and her prospective victims were unprepared; that not alone the German Government but the German people, too, sought it and were responsible for it; that it has been waged by Germany with a deliberate disregard for law, for morals and for humanity which was ordered by the highest authority in the government, which was eagerly executed by

the people, and which has never been surpassed by the most savage and criminal belligerent in history.

German teachers and preachers have been making their pupils cry parrot-like "Gott strafe England!" and "Gott strafe America!" We shall not retort in kind. It is not our business to dispense damnation. But in all dispassionate calmness and deliberation we shall teach our children to enroll William II on the same list with Attila and Nero and Timur Leng, and to remember the German campaigns in Belgium and France as they remember the sacking of Magdeburg, the Reign of Terror, the massacre of Cawnpore, and the Tartar's tower of eighty thousand human skulls. To do otherwise would be to falsify the history of our own times. To do otherwise would be to let our children grow up with false conceptions of the events and conditions which have surrounded them. To do otherwise would be to place the active citizens of the next few years in a false attitude to the great world conditions and relations with which they will be called upon to deal. If the President's national war university scheme shall hasten progress for the fulfilment of this larger and loftier scheme of a new national education, it will be not far from the head of the list of his services to his land and age.

AN UNNECESSARY CONFERENCE

NEWSPAPERS, public men, the public at large, talk about the peace conference that will be held at the close of the war to discuss the terms of peace with Germany. They assume that a peace conference will be held as a matter of course. It will be in accordance with custom. After every other war the plenipotentiaries of the belligerents have assembled about a table and with much solemnity decided upon the conditions to bring the war to an end. Their deliberations have frequently been protracted. There has been jockeying and trading, bluff on one side met by bluff on the other, to end in compromise that both sides knew would be the end even while they were insisting they would yield nothing, not an inch of territory or a penny of the demanded indemnity. When the war has been carried on by Powers acting in an alliance, the first effort of their opponents has been directed to rupturing the alliance, to do by diplomacy what they were

unable to accomplish on the field. Sometimes they were successful, and shrewd, unscrupulous, tricky diplomatists have retrieved the fortunes of the defeated commanders. A Talleyrand or a Metternich has been able to play with a Castlereagh or a Rasmuoffsky. Germany has no Talleyrand and Austria no Metternich, but neither has England or France or Italy or the United States. When you sup with the devil it is wise to have a long spoon, but it is wiser still to go hungry.

There is no necessity for a peace conference at the end of this war, and the sooner the newspapers, public men and the public at large cease to talk about a conference and recognize the facts the better it will be in creating a healthy state of public opinion in all the Allied countries, and the sooner it will penetrate the German mind of the treatment the world intends to accord Germany after the close of the hostilities. There is no necessity for a conference because a conference implies adjustment, discussion, concession; surrender here for gain elsewhere; forgiveness for the past and friendship in the future. With Germany there is nothing to discuss because with Germany nothing can be discussed. With Germany a treaty cannot be made because the signature of the Emperor or his ministers to a treaty is worthless. Any bond, agreement or covenant made by Germany is without validity. Germany has repudiated her treaties and publicly declared that they mean nothing to her. To go through the form of concluding a convention with Germany would be idle. Germany by her own acts, by her contempt for the opinion of mankind, by her defiance of international law, by her savagery, lust and cruelty has placed herself outside the pale. There let her remain.

The war will end either with the defeat of Germany or the defeat of the Allies and civilization in the dust. The Allies will not be defeated and civilization will not be destroyed. The war will end when Germany, her armies annihilated or broken, her resources exhausted, the spirit of her people shattered, sues for peace. She will have to ask for peace because she cannot longer carry on the war. She will come as a suppliant because it is impossible for her longer to fight. She will fight to the very last, the Emperor and his fatuous advisers, the junkers and the militarists, the Krupps and the other profiteers making huge fortunes in money that has no value—scraps of paper merely—will drive

their wretched slaves to the slaughter, and to the last man they will be sacrificed while the Kaiser and his devil's brood keep themselves from harm. But the time will come—it is coming fast now that millions of Americans are pouring across the Atlantic and British and French are fighting as in all history no men ever fought before—when the armies of Germany will be merely skeleton armies, and the men and women of Germany behind the lines will be gaunt skeletons, dying of hunger and disease, incapable of resistance.

When that time comes what have we to discuss with Germany? What decent man, Englishman or American, Frenchman or Italian, brown man from India or black man from the Congo, can so far forget his self-respect as to sit at the same table with a German, regard him as an honorable opponent and proceed to discuss with him the terms of peace? We repeat there is nothing to "discuss," for discussion is impossible. All that is necessary is for the Allies to say to Germany: "Here are the conditions we impose. This is the reparation you will make. You can do as we order or you will suffer further punishment."

When a criminal is brought before a judge he does not discuss with him his punishment. He does justice. A criminal is only brought to the bar of justice when flight or resistance no longer avails him. That will be the position of Germany. She is a criminal. She has sought to resist and then to escape by flight. Captured, she must pay the penalty, but it would be a travesty on justice were she to be permitted to argue with her judges, perhaps to escape by further cunning and treachery.

A conference of the Allies is necessary, for they are the bench of justice and they must decide the sentence to be passed. It is for them to create the new world on the ruins of the Central Empires, to bring about the new civilization that will follow from the collapse of a barbarous Germany and a decadent Austria, to take the necessary measures to prevent the world again being drenched in blood.

Germany shall have no mercy, but justice we shall do to her, and it will be justice done without discussion or debate; it will be justice as exact and inexorable as the wrath of God she has provoked.